

## ARGUMENTATION OF THE APPLICANT RELATING TO STRUCTURAL DIFFERENCES

The Examiner has responded that that the references fail to show features of the applicant's invention and that the limitations from the specifications are not read into the claims. Claims 57 and 66 were rejected as being anticipated by US 6.122.898 De Kort

In responding to this response, the Applicant has amended claim 76 to include the previously presented claim 66 in order to show mechanical structure of the gripper with a spring type element (supported by Fig. 2 and 4 and page 6 line 4-13) and specified as operating by grasping and holding the substrate at the front edge. (supported by PCT page 2 line 7 and page 17 line 16-19)

The finishing process of rotary punching is further specified as contour punching in order to distinguish over cutting (in a straight line with a blade) only.(supported by PCT page 3 Fig. 7)

The punching is further specified as adjustable to changed processing shapes (supported by PCT page 2 line 21)

The disposal device is specified to be using an airflow and specified as facing one of the processing rollers. (supported by PCT claim 16 and 43)

The Applicant submits that claim 76 is also distinguished from the prior art due to De Kort for the following reasons:

The De Kort discloses a cutting and sealing system applying a cutting blade (21) only to separate a stream (see col.3 line 23). It is not and cannot be structured for contour punching with changed processing shapes in order to separate waste (in all kind of shapes) from the usefull

part at the working gap or at a later stage, with a separate process, pre-punched substrates.

The De Kort discloses suction cups (without spring type elements) (24 and 29) not grasping nor holding the front edge of the substrate. The De Kort discloses suction cups to be applied only in the middle of the product.(see col.3 line 28)

The De Kort does not disclose a disposal system facing one of the processing rollers.

The De Kort does not disclose a punched sheet like substrate to be a punched product or an intermediate pre-punched product

The De kort does not disclose transporting the unpunched substrate and the pre-punched intermediate product.

The De Kort does not disclose a disposal device

The dependent claims of record have been cancelled or amended appropriately for consistency with amended claim 76.

The Applicant therefore submits that the independent claim 76 now is sufficiently distinguished from the prior art of record to satisfy the conditions for patenting. The dependent claims inherit the limitations of the independent claim and are therefore similarly distinguished from the prior art of record for the reasons given. The advantages associated with the structural differences between prior art and the invention indicated above, provide sufficient justification for patenting. Positive review and passage to issuance is therefore respectfully requested.

No new matter has been added in this amendment.

8

Respectfully submitted,

Ebe Hesterman,

The Inventor



Date August 30, 2007

Dreiss, Fuhlendorf, Steimle & Becker

Patentanwaelte

Postfach 10 37 62

D-70032 Stuttgart

Federal Republic of Germany

Telephone: ++49/711-24 89 38-0

Fax: ++49/711-24 89 38-99